DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 167 C 003 052

By-Rodriguez-Cano, Felipe

An Analysis of the Mexican American Migrant Labor Force in the Stockbridge Area.

Pub Date 66

Note-97p.; Master's Thesis submitted to Michigan State Univ., Department of Sociology, 1966.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.95

Descriptors-Area Studies, Behavior Patterns, *Demography, *Economic Factors, Educational Attitudes, *Mexican Americans, *Migrant Workers, Questionnaires, *Social Characteristics, Spanish Speaking, Tables (Data)

Identifiers-*Michigan

A descriptive and exploratory study designed to determine demographic and behavioral characteristics of Spanish-speaking migrant workers was conducted in the Stockbridge, Michigan, area. Economic, social, and demographic characteristics (such as age, educational level, income, and family size) and behavioral patterns (such as recruitment and decision-making processes, work experience satisfactions, and aspirations) were analyzed by means of interviews and questionnaires. It was found that this group was relatively young, had a low level of education and income, had an average family size of 3.6 children, was of Mexican descent, and was born in Texas. It was also found that the Mexican American workers had little non-farm experience, were satisfied with farm labor, aspired for better jobs and more education for their children, and had a feeling of alienation. The older workers appeared more satisfied, and the younger workers had higher aspirations. Questionnaires utilized in the study are contained in the appendix. (SW)

ED026167

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN MIGRANT LABOR FORCE IN THE STOCKBRIDGE AREA

By

Felipe Rodriguez-Cano

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1966

RC003052

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN MIGRANT LABOR FORCE IN THE STOCKBRIDGE AREA

By

Felipe Rodriguez-Cano

This thesis reports on a study of the Mexican-American hired farm labor force in the area of Stockbridge, Michigan. The purpose was to learn about the demographic and behavioral characteristics of the Spanish speaking migrant workers.

Since this is a descriptive and exploratory study, no general hypotheses were formulated. It describes the economic, social and demographic characteristics such as age, educational level, income, family size, and also analyzes the behavioral pattern of the migrant workers such as recruitment and decision making processes, past work experience, satisfactions, aspirations and other aspects of their style of life.

The findings show that in general this group is relatively young, with a low level of education, low income, nearly an average family size (3.6 children). The workers are of Mexican descendant, but were born and now live in Texas.

It was also found that the Mexican-American workers have

little non-farm experience and are more or less satisfied with this type of job. At the same time, they do aspire for better jobs, a better life and more education for their children.

A feeling of alineation was found among this group with the social interaction, communication and social participation between migrant workers and the rest of the American society being rather small.

The measures of satisfaction among workers were positively related to an older age, being married, having less educated, getting less personal income, and having a small family size. Those workers with high aspiration levels tended to be younger, to have greater fluency in English, to be unmarried, to have more education, to have more income, and to travel more widely in their work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am happy to record my deep and extreme gratitude to Dr. James R. Hundley, chairman of the committee for this thesis, for the opportunity he gave me to work under his direction on this project, and for his counseling, supervision and friendship.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge and express my gratefulness to my major professor Dr. J. Allan Beegle who without his academic guidance and patient indulgence my work would not have been possible at all.

Also, I am grateful to Dr. Everett M. Rogers who played the role of personal adviser and friend during my studies.

My sincere gratefulness to The Ford Foundation for its financial support of my studies.

And, last but far from least, I acknowledge to the Mexican-American migrant workers for their cooperation given to this study.

Dedication

To my wife Maria del Carmen
for her lovely support and
patience during my studies
at Michigan State University

To my son Felipe

TABLE CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. ii

LIST OF TABLES. vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background and Purpose of the Study 1
Procedures. 5
The Location of the Study 8
Order of Presentation of the Data 10

II. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION STUDIED. 11

Age 11
Educational Level 12
Income. 13
Marital Status. 16
Family Size and Age of Children and Wives. 16
Educational Experience of Family. 18
Language. 21
Religious Faith 23
Status of Origin and Residence. 23
Migrancy. 24
Summary 28

III. RECRUITMENT PROCESS, PAST EXPERIENCE, SATISFACTIONS, ASPIRATIONS AND STYLE OF LIFE OF THE POPULATION STUDIED 30

Recruitment Process 30
Decision Making Process in Job Selection. . 34
Past Work Experience. 36
Satisfactions 38
Aspirations 40
Style of Life of the Mexican-American Farm Migrant Workers 42
Summary 46

Chapter Page

IV. MIGRANT LABORER SATISFACTIONS AND ASPIRATIONS: SOME CORRELATES 48

Present Job Satisfaction. 49
Farm Work Occupational Satisfaction as a Way of Life 50
Job Aspiration For and By Youth 51
Educational Aspirations 52

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 54

Demographic Characteristics 54
Behavior Patterns and Attitudes 56
Predispositions for Change: Characteristics Related to High Levels of Satisfactions and Aspirations. 58

Conclusions 59
General. 59
Sociological Notions 60
Practical Implications 62

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 64

APPENDICES. 65

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Age of Migrant Workers Studied 11

2 Number of Years of School Attended by Migrant Workers. 13

3 Total Personal and Non-Farm Income of Migrant Workers. 14

4 Family Income of Migrant Workers and Other Members of the Family 15

5 Marital Status of Migrant Workers. 16

6 Ages of Children Receiving Support from Heads of Family. 18

7 School Attendance by and Plans for Summer School for Children of Migrant Workers. . . 19

8 Grade Level in School and Years Behind a Normal Grade Based on Age for Children of Migrant Workers. 20

9 Years of School of the Migrant Workers' Wives and Migrant Worker Himself. 21

10 Language Abilities of the Population Studied . 22

11 States of Origin and Residence of Migrant Workers 25

12 Times Having Been in Stockbridge Area. 26

13 Degree of Out of Michigan Work Done by Migrant Workers. 28

14 Sources of Information Where Migrant Workers Heard About their Job and Who Contracted Them 32

15 Type of Discussion Before Taking The Job . . . 35

16 Different Kinds of Jobs Done in the Past by the Migrant Workers Studied. 37

Table Page

17 Answers to "How Do You Like This Job?" by Migrant Workers. 38

18 Opinions About the Farm Work as a Good Way of Life and as a Good Job for Children. 39

19 Nature of Aspirations for Migrant Workers (Single males) and Migrant Workers' Children. 41

20 Statistical Analysis of Ten Independent Variables and Four Dependent Variables Studied Among Migrant Workers 49

CHAPTER I

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN MIGRANT LABOR FORCE IN THE STOCKBRIDGE AREA

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose of the Study

Each year 146,000 people work for wages in Michigan's seasonal agricultural activities. Local sources supply 44.5 percent of this figure, intrastate sources contribute 12.3 percent, and interstate sources supply the rest. According to the best figures available, Texas supplies 54.3 percent of the interstate labor force, Louisiana, 14.3 percent; Missouri, 7.6 percent; Florida, 6.5 percent; Ohio, 4.2 percent; Arkansas, 3.8 percent; Mississippi, 2.5 percent; Puerto Rico, 1.3 percent, and the other states, 5.5 percent.[1]

Clearly, the majority of interstate migrant labor force originates from Texas and is made up of Spanish-speaking people who have migrated to the United States from Mexico and are descendants of Mexican people of two or three generations ago. The lack of knowledge about these farm workers, their families, and their environment, is a major problem which impedes sociologists and other professionals working with these people in welfare related programs.

---

[1] Data taken from Michigan Farm Labor Report 1964. Michigan Employment Security Commission, Employment Service Division, Detroit, Michigan, 1964.

The migrant farm worker is a significant economic factor in a dynamic agri-business today, and knowing the problems of these workers should help in understanding an important aspect of agricultural production. Rural sociologists know very little about how the migrant workers live, how they are recruited, and where they come from. Knowledge is needed about the socio-demographic characteristics of the migrant workers, such as age, sex, education, income, family size, etc. It is necessary to know more about methods of wage payment, the families' problems and their earnings from farm and urban work, in order to understand their performance in their occupation.

Many reports about migrant laborers and their work as well as some of their problems have been done by different governmental agencies, universities, and private foundations. Most of these reports deal with the general situation within which the migrant worker acts. However, few studies have been done on the Spanish-speaking people in the migratory farm labor force. In 1941, Thaden studied the migratory beet workers in Michigan.[1] In this study, he worked with Mexican nationals in the beet belt in Michigan and Ohio studying, among other factors, some demographic characteristics of these laborers.

---

[1] J. H. Thaden, Migratory Beet Workers in Michigan, Special Bulletin #319 (Sept., 1942), Michigan State College Agr. Exp. Station, East Lansing, Michigan.

Metzler,[1] in his study, "The Farm Worker in a Changing Agriculture," describes some demographic characteristics of the farm labor force in Kern County, California. However, his study deals mostly with how technological change, such as mechanization, eliminates manual labor in Kern County.

Andrews and Nagi describe the migrant agricultural laborer in Ohio.[2] Among other aspects, they describe the methods of recruitment, transportation, origin of the migrant workers, type of work they perform, wages and methods of payment, social and economic problems of the migrants, and state labor laws applicable to agricultural workers.

Taylor[3] in a report titled "An Approach to the Migratory Labor Problem Through Legislation" analyzed some specific problems of the migrant workers in Wisconsin such as earnings and working conditions, child welfare, recruitment, housing, health and medical care, transportation, social security and assistance, collective bargaining and civil rights. He also submitted a proposal for legislation on both the federal and state levels for these problems. Schmidt summarizes and discussed the findings on the problems of farm labor recruitment in California.[1] Jorgensen and others analyzed and evaluated the education and housing problems of the Spanish speaking migrant workers in Texas and Iowa.[2]

---

[1] William H. Metzler, The Farm Worker in A Changing Agriculture, California Agri. Exp. Station and the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Giannini Foundation Research Report #277 (Sept., 1964).

[2] Wade H. Andrews and Saad Z. Nagi, Migrant Agricultural Labor in Ohio, Ohio Agricultural Experimental Station, Wooster, Ohio, Research Bulletin 780, Sept. 1956.

[3] Milton C. Taylor, An Approach to the Migratory Labor Problem Through Legislation, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Governor's Commission on Human Rights, Madison, Wisconsin, August, 1950.

In summary, most of the literature on migrant worker characteristics and styles of life are done for the motive of producing or facilitating social change in the areas of wages, housing, and education. Few studies have objectively attempted to describe Spanish speaking migrant workers.

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate the economic, social, and demographic characteristics of the Spanish-speaking portion of the migratory labor force in the area of Stockbridge, Michigan. A study of the migratory workers in that area should contribute to the understanding of an important aspect of agricultural production in Michigan -- the migrant labor force. This study focuses on the hired workers who do unskilled farm work. It covers the work experience of these laborers such as existing skills and past training as well as the satisfactions these laborers gain from their farm work, what they perceive their needs to be, and what their aspirations are. In addition, this study deals with the life style of the migrant worker and his family, the community's attitude toward the migrants and their families, the social participation of migrant workers in a community different from their own, and the relationship between worker and farmer, worker and other workers, the worker's family with other families, and the worker with the society in general.

---

[1] Fred H. Schmidt, After the Bracero: An Inquiring into the Problems of Farm Labor Recruitment. Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles, Oct. 1964.

[2] Janet M. Jorgensen, David E. Williams and John H. Burma. Migratory Agricultural Workers in the United States. Mimeo Report. Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. No date given. (Probably after 1960.)

Procedures

Sample and Methods of Collecting Data. For the purpose of this survey a sample of 45 Spanish-speaking migrant workers from the total migrant population in the area of Stockbridge, Michigan, was studied. A non-probability but purposive sample was used for this research because (a) it was difficult to obtain the total number of workers in the area of the study due to the fact that all the workers did not arrive in Stockbridge at the same time and (b) the research interest was in the migrant worker of Spanish descent.

The method of collecting data used in this study was the personal interview method. Formal interviews (with the use of questionnaires) were held with migrants and informal interviews were held with the farmers who employ these workers.

The interviews were taken from May 30 to June 20, during spring planting of onions and lettuce and cutting of sod. The interviews were conducted in Spanish; in this manner the interviewers obtained confidence of the workers and established rapport with them. Additional information was gathered from key persons in the community of Stockbridge and from observations made by the two interviewers while gathering data in the area.

In the personal interviews with the migrants the formal data were gathered from two sources: heads of family and single males, 16 years or older. Of the total sample of 45 workers, 33 were heads of families (73 percent) and 12 were single males (27 percent).

In choosing the farms from which the sample of workers was to be taken, farmers regularly employing Spanish speaking laborers for seasonal work were identified. Several Spanish speaking people who live regularly on the farms were not included. Of ten large farms which had employed migrant workers with Spanish speaking background, only four of them were employing these people at the time of the survey. These four farms were not bordering or adjacent to one another. One farm was located near Munith, in Jackson County; another was located near Gregory, in Livingston County and the other two farms were located in Ingham County, but in different townships. All the farms were within 10-15 miles of Stockbridge.

The distribution of the sample taken was of sufficient heterogeneity so as to be generally representative of the total population of Mexican-American laborers working in the area at the time of the study. The formal (from migrants) and informal (from farmers, key persons, and observation) data gathered in the survey give a general picture of the migrant force in the area of Stockbridge adequate for the purposes of this study.

The Schedule. A schedule of 100 questions was developed which was concerned with: (1) demographic characteristics, (2) jobs held by the individuals in the past, including farm and urban jobs, experiences in both kinds of jobs, duration of past jobs, etc., (3) the migratory history of the workers, i.e., places of origin and residence before coming to the area of the study, (4) recruitment and decision making processes, satisfaction with the farm work, aspirations for themselves and their children, and styles of life, including social relations, recreation, means of transportation, etc.[1]

The field work was done on the four farms previously indicated. It was carried on in the evenings after 6 p.m.

---

[1] For a statement of the interview schedule in both Spanish and English, see Appendix A.

and on Sundays. Before the interviews were held with the laborers, informal conversations and interviews were held with the farmers. For the farmer interviews, a special schedule of 12 questions was used.[1] The information obtained from this source contributed to the total data for the study. The information gathered from farmers was concerned with their satisfaction with the work of the migrants on their farms, housing for the workers and their families, their problems in getting hired workers, and other factors related to the migratory laborers and their families.

The Location of the Study

The area where this study was done is located in the southeast central part of the state of Michigan. The community of Stockbridge is the seat of the Township of Stockbridge. It is located in the southeastern part of Ingham County, 40 miles from Lansing. The area where the study was carried out also includes some communities in other counties such as Jackson and Livingston Counties. In these latter counties are located Munith, and Gregory, respectively. However, Stockbridge is the trade center for the whole area.

The economy of the area is based on agriculture and livestock. Thus, the life of these communities centers around these activities. The main crops in the area are corn, truck crops, wheat and hay. Also, in some parts of the area soybeans and dry beans are grown.

---

[1] See Appendix A.

Dairy and beef cattle are raised in the area. There are several dairy farms with an average of 80 milk cows per farm. The raising of beef cattle is rapidly increasing in the area and most of the corn produced is used to feed these cattle.

Among the truck crops, the main vegetables are onions and lettuce. In addition asparagus, peppermint, and cucumbers are found in the area in small acreage. Also, there is a rapid increase in the number of acres used for the production of blue grass sod.

The size of the farms in this general area is increasing, while the number of farms is decreasing. Thus, around ten farmers control the whole truck crop area. The value of the agricultural and livestock activities of the area is increasing. Several farmer organizations operate in the area which was studied. The most important ones are Farm Bureau, The National Farmers Organization and the Michigan Milk Producers Association. Also, other social organizations related to agriculture are found in the Stockbridge area. Of these organizations, the main ones are: the Vocational Agricultural High School, located in Stockbridge; several 4-H Clubs in Munith, Gregory, Leslie, Stockbridge, etc. and the Cooperative

Extension Service of the three counties in which the area under study is located.

Order of Presentation of the Data

Chapter II describes the socio-economic characteristics of the migrant labor force in the area of Stockbridge. Knowledge of these characteristics is essential in order to have a greater understanding of the migrant labor force. Chapter III describes other factors of the migrant labor force in this area, such as recruitment and decision making processes, satisfaction and aspirations of the laborers and the life style of the migrant workers. Chapter IV analyzes statistically some of the demographic characteristics and relates these characteristics with satisfactions and aspirations. These statistical associations are made in order to discover the differences between the work satisfactions and aspirations of migrant workers with different characteristics. Chapter V concludes and summarizes the study and presents some suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION STUDIED

Age

The 45 Spanish speaking migrant workers in the area of Stockbridge who were included in this study were relatively young. More than half of the total sample were under 30 years of age (Table 1). Twenty-two percent (10 workers) were under 19 years of age and 33 percent (15 individuals) were in the 20 to 29 year age bracket. Of the total sample, 24 percent (11 workers) were from 30 to 49 years of age and 20 percent were over 50 years old. Only 7 percent (3 workers) of the total population studied were over 60 years old.

TABLE 1

AGE OF MIGRANT WORKERS STUDIED IN
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Age	Number	Percent
Under 19	10	22.2
20 - 29	15	33.3
30 - 39	6	13.3
40 - 49	5	11.1
50 - 59	6	13.3
60 and over	3	6.7

Educational Level

Prominent among migrant workers is a lack of education comparable to the rest of American society. The average educational level of the total group of the migrant workers studied is 3.7 years. One reason for this average is the educational differences between some old and young persons. Of this total sample, it was found that seven workers (16 percent of the total group) are illiterate, while only one worker (2 percent) has more than a high school education. This man attended college for two years in Mexico and from the time he finished his studies until this year his jobs were in an office. However, family reasons obligated him to leave the city and work at a farm job. He married the daughter of a migrant worker!

Of the total sample studied, 18 workers (40 percent) attended less than 6 years of school and 19 workers (42 percent) have 7 or more years of education, but none of these 19 finished high school (Table 2).

Some of the workers in the sample attended school in Mexico, and some of them continued their education in the United States. Educational opportunity for the young people has increased greatly during recent years, and most of them are taking advantage of it. Half of the sample of single males 16 years of age and over are enrolled in school and

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF YEARS OF SCHOOL ATTENDED BY MIGRANT WORKERS IN STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Years of School	Number of Workers	Percent
None	7	15.5
2	2	4.4
3	4	8.8
4	2	4.4
5	6	13.3
6	5	11.1
7	9	20.0
8	4	8.8
9	2	4.4
10	2	4.4
11	1	2.2
More than 12	1	2.2

they plan to continue their studies when the school year resumes next fall.

Income

Migrant workers were questioned about their earnings in each job held during the past year. For the purposes of this study, the income reported by the workers interviewed was divided into two categories: personal and family income.

Of the 45 farm laborers interviewed, 5 of them (11 percent) could not state what their personal income was last year. Some of these workers were single males whose salaries or wages were included in the checks paid to the family as a whole. Almost one third of the total sample studied (31 percent) had a personal income of $1500-2500 last year. Seven workers (16 percent) earned under $1000 during the same period of time and only two persons earned $4000 or more last year. The average personal income for the migrant workers within the sample was $1890 last year.

In studying the personal income of the workers in the sample, the author found that 19 workers (42 percent) earned money from sources other than farm work last year. Of these 19 laborers, the average earned was $486, varying from one worker who earned $150 to another who earned $2200 from non-farm work. (Table 3).

TABLE 3

TOTAL PERSONAL AND NON-FARM INCOME OF MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Total Personal Income		Personal Non-Farm Income	
Dollars	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	N=45		N=19	
0 - 999	7	15.6	11	57.8
1000 - 1499	9	20.0	2	10.5
1500 - 2499	14	31.1	6	31.5
2500 - 3999	8	17.8	--	--
4000 and over	2	4.4	--	--
No answer	5	11.1	--	--

The average family income was $2635 last year. Of the total number of laborers interviewed, one-third could not answer the question concerning the total family income. Most of these workers were single males who did not know about the earnings of other members of the family.

One-third of the group studied (15 families) had a total family income of $2000-4000 last year. One family had an income under $1000, nine families (20 percent) had an income of $1000-2000 last year, and five families (11 percent) had an income of $4000 or over.

Earnings by wives and children contributed to the income of the migrant families last year. Fifteen of the 33 heads of families interviewed stated that their wives were working last year. The average wives' income last year was $573.

One-third of the heads of family (11 workers) said that some of their children worked last year. The average child's earnings last year was $663 (Table 4).

TABLE 4

FAMILY INCOME OF MIGRANT WORKERS AND
OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY,
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Total Family		Wives		Children	
Dollars	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	N=45		N=33		N=33	
0 - 999	1	2.2	14	42.2	10	30.3
1000 - 1999	9	20.0	1	3.3	--	--
2000 - 3999	15	33.3	--	--	1	3.3
4000 and over	5	11.1	--	--	--	--
No answer	15	33.3	18	54.4	22	66.6

Marital Status

With regard to this demographic characteristic, 31 of the 33 heads of family answered that they are married. One said that he is a widower and one reported that he is separated. However, each of these latter workers has a family to support. For that reason, they were included within the "heads of family" group.

Of the total sample studied 12 are single (Table 5). The author included within this group a man who is divorced and without children or any ties with his former wife. He was married when he was 16 years old and at the time of the survey, he was 18. Since this man does not have a family to support, he was included in the group of single males.

TABLE 5

MARITAL STATUS OF MIGRANT WORKERS,
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Number	Percent
Married	31	68.8
Single	12	26.6
Widower	1	2.2
Separated	1	2.2

Family Size and Age of Children and Wives

Family size is another socio-demographic characteristic studied. Twelve percent of the heads of families said that they did not have children at the time of the study. Twenty-one percent (7 workers) said that they each had one child.

Three workers (9 percent) said they had 8 children, this being the largest number of children in any migrant family. The breakdown for size of families between the two extremes of one child and 8 children is given in Table 6. The average family size of the migrant workers in the area of Stockbridge was 3.6 persons. This average includes only the children of the heads of families and their wives and excludes some other persons supported by the heads of families. The total number of children of the heads of families interviewed was 97. The children's ages were from under one year old to 25 years of age and over. The age brackets of the offspring receiving support from heads of families are given in Table 6. The data show that 68 percent of the children are between the ages of 1-14 years. This means the average family has at least two children of non-working age to support.

Sixty percent of the workers' wives were under 40 years of age. The average age of all wives was 34. Although the wives ages ranged considerably, they were generally rather young.

The workers were asked whether or not their families were with them and if all their single children were with them. Ninety-one percent of the workers interviewed said all

TABLE 6

AGES OF CHILDREN RECEIVING SUPPORT FROM HEADS OF FAMILY, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Number of Children	Percent
Under 1 year	2	2.0
1 - 4 years old	20	20.6
5 - 9 " "	23	23.7
10 - 14 " "	21	21.8
15 - 19 " "	18	18.5
20 - 24 " "	8	8.2
25 - 29 " "	1	1.0
No answer	4	4.1

family members were together on the job while 73 percent of the families had all single children at the farm work location. These findings indicate that most migrant workers move from their place of residence to the area of work with their families. These families sometimes include grandparents, in-laws, and others.

Educational Experience of Family

Several questions dealing with the education of the children were included in the schedule. Twenty workers (61 percent) said they had children attending school; the rest gave no answer (Table 7). Those who gave no answer include individuals whose children are too young to attend school or who do not have children. Only seven heads of families

TABLE 7

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE BY AND PLANS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Responses	School Attendance		Plans for Summer School	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	20	60.6	7	21.2
No	--	--	17	51.5
No answer	13	39.3	9	27.2

(21 percent) had plans to send their children to the special summer school for children. Most respondents knew nothing of this special school.

An important factor regarding the children of migrant workers is the level of education reached. The average years of school completed for the total population of children at school age (from 5 to 18 years old) was 5.1 grades.

Concerning the level of education completed at the time of the survey, it was found that of ten children at kindergarten age (5-6 years of age) only one was or had been in kindergarten. Thirty-four children were in the 1-6 grades group. Ten children were in the 7-12 grades bracket, and seventeen children were school drop-outs at different grades ranging from 1 to 10 grades. The average educational level for those youths who had dropped out of school was 5.4 years.

How far behind in school are Mexican-American migrant children when compared to their age? It was found that of those in grades 1-6, ten children were not behind in school for their age, seven children were one year behind in school, seven other children were two years behind, and ten children were three or more years behind. On the average, migrant children in grades 1-6 were 1.5 grades behind.

In the 7-12 grades group, the findings show that two children were at the normal grade level for their age, six children were one year behind, one child was two years behind, and another child was three years behind. The average years behind for children in school for grades 7-12 was 1.1 grades (Table 8).

TABLE 8

GRADE LEVEL IN SCHOOL AND YEARS BEHIND A NORMAL GRADE LEVEL BASED ON AGE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Years Behind Average Child	1 - 6 Grades		7 - 12 Grades	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	10	29.4	2	20.0
1	7	20.6	6	60.0
2	7	20.6	1	10.0
3 or more	10	29.4	1	10.0

It was found that the wives' level of education is lower than the migrant workers' level of education. The average years of school completed by the migrant workers' wives is 3.0 grades, while the migrant workers' average is 3.7 years of school completed (Table 9). The responses show that five wives (15 percent) are illiterate; 13 respondents' wives (41 percent) have completed less than 6 years of education; 8 wives (25 percent) have completed more than 6 years of school, but less than junior high school; 3 wives (10 percent) have completed more than junior high school, but less than senior high school, and only 2 wives (7 percent) have a high school education.

TABLE 9

YEARS OF SCHOOL OF THE MIGRANT WORKERS' WIVES AND THE MIGRANT WORKER HIMSELF, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Years of Schooling	Wife N=33		Migrant N=45	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	5	15.1	7	15.6
Less than 6 years	13	41.0	18	40.0
More than 6 but less than junior high school	8	24.7	13	28.9
More than junior, but less than senior high school	3	9.9	6	13.3
More than high school	2	6.6	1	2.2

Language

All the workers in the sample studied in the Stockbridge area were Spanish speaking people since their native or mother language is Spanish. However, more than half of the sample (60 percent) speak English; the rest (40 percent) speak only Spanish but some of them understand English.

Of the 27 migrant workers who also speak English, 11 of them (41 percent) said that they have some problems with English. The rest, 16 respondents (59 percent), answered that they do not have any problems of this kind. Almost the entire English speaking group is formed of young people who attended or now attend school; it is the older people (over 40 years of age) who do not speak English (Table 10).

TABLE 10

LANGUAGE ABILITIES OF THE POPULATION STUDIED IN STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Number	Percent
Speak only Spanish	18	40.0
Have trouble with English	11	24.4
No trouble with English	16	35.6

A general feeling of the workers studied is that for some of them the language is the main barrier for getting a job other than farm work. Some of them have enough experience on other types of jobs, but they have the problem of language keeping them from developing their abilities.

Religious Faith

The whole population of the sample, 45 workers and their families, are Roman Catholic. When asked whether or not they felt it was important to attend church, only 2 persons (4 percent) answered no.

The degree of church attendance for the group of migrant laborers and their families during the work season is very low. The main reason is the lack of Roman Catholic churches in the area of Stockbridge. However, some religious groups from Lansing or Jackson go to the camps where the migrant workers and their families are living in order to perform religious ceremonies such as saying mass, performing weddings and baptisms, and hearing confessions.

States of Origin and Residence

In order to know where the migrant workers come from and how they move from one place to another, they were questioned about their state of origin and the state of residence before coming to the Stockbridge area. Of the 45 laborers interviewed, more than half of them, 28 (62 percent) were born in Texas and 3 workers (7 percent) were born in Michigan. The rest of the migrant workers (31 percent) are of Mexican origin. All the workers who were born in the United States are of Mexican descent in the first or second generation.

The majority of the workers originally come from a city. Twenty-eight workers (62 percent) are from the city, while 13 respondents (29 percent) are from farm communities. The remaining 4 laborers (9 percent) are from non-farm communities of less than 2500 inhabitants. Now, almost 90 percent of the total sample live in cities sometime during the year. This means that these people go from the city where they live normally to the country for work.

With regard to the state of residence before coming to the area of Stockbridge, the findings show that 40 workers (89 percent) are now residents of Texas. Of the rest, 4 workers (9 percent of the total) are residents of Mexico. One worker was living in Wisconsin before he came to the area studied. The two Mexican states where 4 workers were living before coming to the Stockbridge area are located on the border of the United States (Table 11).

Migrancy

Much of the farm work in the area of Stockbridge is done by migrant workers. For this work, farmers in the area employ workers with an American background, especially from Kentucky, and also people with a Spanish or Mexican background. Both ethnic groups are primarily engaged in onion, lettuce and sod operations in the area of study.

TABLE 11

STATES OF ORIGIN AND RESIDENCE OF MIGRANT WORKERS IN STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

States	Origin		Residence	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Texas	28	62.2	40	88.9
Tamaulipas	5	11.1	3	6.6
Nuevo Leon	4	8.9	--	--
Coahuila	2	4.4	1	2.2
San Luis Potosi	1	2.2	--	--
Zacatecas	1	2.2	--	--
Michoacan	1	2.2	--	--
Michigan	3	6.6	--	--
Wisconsin	--	--	1	2.2

Mueller[1] defines the migrant farm laborer as a worker whose income is derived from temporary farm employment and who moves one or two times a year, frequently through several states. They are also employed by processing plants which operate for short periods of time.

All of the 45 workers studied belong to the migrant labor force. This means that they come from their place of residence to this area for work during a particular season of the year. In order to measure the degree of migrancy (mobility) of the group working in the Stockbridge area, they were classified into three categories: (1) local, (2) state, and (3) national migrancy.

---

[1] Louis E. Mueller, M. D. "Migrant Labor in Ohio." Ohio's Health, Vol. VI, No. 10, October, 1954.

Local migrancy refers to the worker who was new or old in the area of study. The author found that 29 workers (64 percent) had worked in the area before, while only 16 respondents (36 percent) were new to the Stockbridge area.

The next indication of the degree of local migrancy was to find out from the people who have worked in the area before how many times they have worked there. From the 29 individuals who said they were old in the area, 8 (28 percent) have worked there twice before; 6 workers (21 percent) have worked three times before; 8 respondents (28 percent) have worked there four times before, and 7 laborers (24 percent) have worked there five or more times before (Table 12).

TABLE 12

TIMES HAVING BEEN IN STOCKBRIDGE AREA, MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Times	Number	Percent
New	16	35.6
Two-Three	14	31.1
Four or more	15	33.3

The degree of intrastate migrancy was measured by questioning the farm workers about other places in Michigan where they have worked. The findings show that 23 workers (51 percent) said they have worked only in the area of Stockbridge; the remaining 22 respondents (49 percent) answered that they have worked in other places in Michigan before.

The main places in the state of Michigan where the workers said they have worked before were: Traverse City (17 percent of those who have worked in other parts of the state); Lansing (17 percent); Leslie, Grand Rapids and Jackson (10 percent each); Saginaw and Hart (7 percent each); and Old Michigan, Capac, Brox Side, Ithaca, Caro, and St. Johns (3 percent each).

The last factor concerning migrancy was the degree of national migrancy or interstate mobility of the laborers studied. In order to measure this workers were asked in which other states in addition to Michigan and their state of residence, they have worked. Table 13 shows that 12 respondents (27 percent) worked in Michigan only (plus state of residence), 10 respondents (22 percent) have worked in Michigan and the Midwest, 15 persons (33 percent) have worked in Michigan, Midwest, and Western states, while 8 workers (18 percent) have worked only in Michigan and Western states.[1]

---

[1] Midwestern states include: Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota and Michigan. The Western states include: Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

TABLE 13

DEGREE OF OUT OF MICHIGAN WORK DONE BY MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

States	Number	Percent
Michigan only (plus state of residence)	12	26.7
Michigan and Midwest	10	22.2
Michigan, Midwest and Western states	15	33.3
Michigan and Western states	8	17.8

Summary

More than half of the population studied was under 30 years old. The level of education was very low and the average of years completed by migrant workers was 3.7. The average personal and family income was $1890 and $2635 respectively last year. Thirty-one of the workers were married, twelve were single, one widower and one separated. The average family size was 3.6 children. The children's ages were from under one year old to 25 years of age. The average age for the wives was 34 years old. More than half of the migrants' children attend school; the average of school completed by the migrants' children was 5.1. The wives' average education is 3.0 years of school.

All the workers were Spanish speaking and 60 percent of them also speak English. The sample studied was totally

Roman Catholic; sixty-two percent of them were born in Texas, seven percent in Michigan, and thirty-one percent in Mexico. All workers were of Mexican descent in the first or second generation; 89 percent reside in Texas and 9 percent reside in Mexico. The sample has a high degree of mobility or migrancy with 64 percent working before in the area, 49 percent having worked in other places in Michigan and 73 percent having worked in other states besides Michigan and their state of residence.

CHAPTER III

RECRUITMENT PROCESS, PAST EXPERIENCE, SATISFACTIONS, ASPIRATIONS, AND STYLE OF LIFE OF THE POPULATION STUDIED

Chapter II described the demographic characteristics of the Mexican-American migrant labor force in the area of Stockbridge, Michigan. But more than characteristics are needed to understand the migrant worker. This chapter will describe some predominant behavioral patterns and attitudes of the migrant workers related to their occupation. The recruitment and job decision making processes, the past work experience, satisfaction with present work, aspirations for self and family and general style of life of these workers are described. These analyses and descriptions are necessary to correlate with the demographic characteristics and supplement them. Levels of satisfaction and aspiration will be used in Chapter IV as dependent variables which are crucial for the understanding of the likelihood of change in the migrant pattern of life.

Recruitment Process

In trying to understand the peculiar characteristics of highly mobile "migrant" workers, we need to know how migrant workers are recruited. Where they hear about the farm work? Who contracted them? What means of transportation do they use from their places of residence to the area of work. This section of Chapter III deals with these aspects of the migratory labor force working in the area of Stockbridge.

First, almost half of the population studied heard about his present job through a crew leader (Table 13). The second most important source of information about the present job was relatives. Other sources by which migrant workers heard about their job include friends and the farmer employer. However, one interesting finding is that only one worker reported that he heard about the present work through a Farm Employment Office.

The second part of the recruitment process is to know who contracted the migrant laborers for their present job. The responses show that 19 persons (42 percent) said that they were contracted through a crew leader; 16 workers (36 percent) answered that they were contracted directly by the farmer. This latter figure includes all who applied for a job directly to the farmer. Of the rest of the population studied, 9 workers (20 percent) said that nobody contracted them, and only one person said that he was contracted through a Farm Employment Office (Table 14). It should be clarified that there are no crew leaders (in a supervisory sense)

TABLE 14

SOURCES OF INFORMATION WHERE MIGRANT WORKERS HEARD ABOUT THEIR JOB AND WHO CONTRACTED THEM, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Sources	Where Heard		Contracted By	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Crew leader	21	46.7	19	42.2
Family	7	15.6	--	--
Direct from Farmer	4	8.9	16	35.6
Friends	5	11.1	--	--
Others	7	15.6	--	--
Nobody	--	--	9	20.0
Employment	1	2.2	1	2.2

among the group studied, but there are some workers who are representatives of farmers and through whom farmers contracted or recruited workers. It is these men that the author previously referred to as crew leaders. Usually, these men make decisions about contracting people and to some degree are responsible for the people contracted.

Apart from the source of information and job contact, we should know the verbalized reasons workers give for coming to the Stockbridge area. Many different answers were given to this question. Twenty-two respondents (49 percent) said that a "better job" or "better pay" was the main reason for coming to the area. This included answers such as family reasons, invitation of a farmer, heard from friends, invitation of friends, they know the farmer, they come here every year, etc. The other 8 persons interviewed (18 percent) answered that their main reason for coming here was due to the fact that no job was available at this time in Texas or their state of residence.

In general, it can be said that the recruitment process takes place through informal connections between farmers and workers. The general pattern is that a worker, who may be a crew leader or not, makes contacts for a group with 3 or more families, very often his close relatives and friends. Thus, it was found that in one of the farms of the sample almost 100 percent of the persons in the migrant labor force came from or are residents of one community in Texas.

The last aspect of the recruitment process concerns how the migrant workers and their families move from their place of residence to the area of Stockbridge. Of the 45 workers interviewed, 27 of them (60 percent) said that they came by car; 17 respondents (38 percent) said they traveled by truck and only one laborer came by bus.

Almost half of the population studied (47 percent) said they did not pay their own travel expenses to Stockbridge. Farmers usually paid the fare. Fourteen persons (31 percent) said they paid some expenses or shared the total cost of the trip with other workers and 10 workers (22 percent) said that they paid for the trip on their own. According to some of the respondents and the farmers who employ these people, the farmer promises to pay the transportation for a worker provided the worker will stay at the farm during the whole working season. Past experience of farmers show that some workers have been recruited by one farmer who pays the transportation, and after 2 or 3 weeks of work on the farm, the worker moves to other farms. So, if the worker stays the whole season, the farmer gives the migrant worker money to cover the cost of his transportation at the end of the work period or season.

Decision Making Process in Job Selection

More than half of the total sample 26 respondents (58 percent) report deciding by himself to work in Stockbridge. In 12 cases (27 percent) the family as a whole made the decision to come. In 7 cases (16 percent) of the single males, the decision to come was made by the father.

The heads of families were asked if they talked with their wives, children, or other persons about the desirability of accepting the present job before coming, in order to get their advice. The findings show that 29 heads of families (88 percent) talked with their wives and 4 of them (12 percent) said they did not talk with their wives about taking this job. More than half of the respondents (20) said they talked over the job with their children, and 12 (36 percent) said they did not. Almost two-thirds of the workers (64 percent) said they did not discuss the job with people outside the family. Seven respondents (21 percent) said they talked with some members of the family outside of their own immediate family, such as a brother, mother, father, etc., and 5 workers (15 percent) answered that they talked with some friends and the crew leader before coming (Table 15). Three-fourths of the single males answered that they talked with their parents and 25 percent said they did not. Only one single male worker said his parents did not ask him to come work on the present job.

TABLE 15

TYPE OF DISCUSSION BEFORE TAKING THE JOB,
MIGRANT WORKERS, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Types	Number	Percent
Talk with family only	37	82.2
Talk with family and other persons	3	6.7
Talk with other persons only	1	2.2
Talked with no other person	4	8.9

Influence from other persons on the decision making process was measured by asking the population studied whether or not somebody influenced them. Three-fourths of the respondents answered that nobody influenced their decision to come. Six workers (13 percent) said they were influenced by a friend and 4 percent of the group said that relatives influenced them.

Past Work Experience

The past experience of the migrant labor force in the area of Stockbridge was categorized into those with previous farm labor experience only and those with some previous non-farm work experience. The second category includes all kinds of work experiences other than agricultural or agricultural-related work. Based on the type of job that the respondent generally does, 82 percent of the group studied had no previous non-farm labor experience ever. Eighteen percent had some non-farm labor work experience.

With regard to past farm labor experience, 29 workers (64 percent) said their farm jobs were manual labor only while 16 laborers (37 percent) said that they could operate some machinery as well as do manual labor.

The respondents mentioned a large number of manual and machine operations (in several crops) in which they have had some past experience. Among these, the most mentioned operations were: picking, cleaning, and weeding of different crops. Tractor and truck driving and general field work were also reported as common operations done by the workers. However, some of the operations reported by the respondents require some training such as, grafting trees, irrigating, and cutting lettuce. The vegetable crops in which the migrant workers mentioned having had past experience were onions, lettuce, and tomatoes. This list of fruits include cherries, apples, peaches and melons along with other crops such as sugar beets and sod.

A large number of non-farm job experiences were reported by the respondents. Although most respondents mentioned only farm work, some also mentioned working for small businesses including such occupations as gas station workers, shop workers, dishwashers, wine preparer, and clerks. A very few urban middle class jobs such as musician, office jobs, and salesmen were given. Some of the migrants have worked as truck drivers, mechanics, painters and carpenters, construction workers, washing cars, railroad and metal foundary workers, and bottling some refreshments such as Coca Cola, Pepsi Cola and others (Table 16).

TABLE 16

DIFFERENT KINDS OF WORK DONE IN THE PAST
BY THE MIGRANT WORKERS STUDIED
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	First Job Given		Second Job Given	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farm	10	22.7	6	13.3
Driver	3	6.8	-	--
Small business employee	9	20.5	6	13.3
Construction	3	6.8	2	4.4
Mechanic	2	4.4	2	4.4
Painter or carpenter	3	6.8	2	4.4
Tractor driver	3	6.8	4	8.9
Urban middle class job	6	13.6	2	4.4
No answer	6	13.6	21	46.7

Satisfaction

One might expect that people doing "hard labor" jobs like migrant farm laborers must be unhappy with their work. However, the answers to the questions indicating job satisfaction of the migrant workers with their present job indicated that the workers were generally satisfied with their job. Of the population studied, 18 percent said that they liked their present farm work "quite a lot." More than one-third, (38 percent) said that they like their job "some what" and the other one-third reported that they like it only "a little." Only 3 workers (7 percent) answered that they "do not like this work at all" (Table 17).

TABLE 17

ANSWERS TO "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS JOB?"
BY MIGRANT WORKERS,
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Number	Percent
Much	8	17.8
Some	17	37.8
A little	17	37.8
Not at all	3	6.7

The following findings support the assumption that workers in the area studied are generally satisfied with their job. The answers to a question which asked, "Are you satisfied or happy with this job?" show that 93 percent of the total sample said that they are satisfied; only one worker (2 percent) answered no to this question and 2 respondents (4 percent) said they like the work "a little."

When the author asked the workers if they think that the present job is a good way of living for themselves and their families, more than half of the group (58 percent) said "yes" while 40 percent answered no. Here we find more dissatisfaction with migrant labor life in general than with specific jobs in Stockbridge. When 12 single males were asked "Do you think that this job is a good one for you?" 5 (42 percent) answered no and 7 (58 percent) answered yes. More dissatisfaction was indicated when 33 heads of families were asked, "Do you think that this job is a good one for your children?" 13 (20 percent) answered yes and 30 (67 percent) answered no (Table 18).

TABLE 18

OPINIONS ABOUT THE FARM WORK AS A GOOD WAY OF LIVING AND AS A GOOD JOB FOR CHILDREN, STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Answers	Way of Living		Good for Children	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	26	57.8	13	28.9
No	18	40.0	30	66.7
No answer	1	2.2	2	4.4

This shows that most migrant workers were satisfied with their present job while nearly half think that it is not a good way of living. Furthermore, they think that farm work like theirs is not a good life for their children.

Aspirations

The workers in the farm labor force in the area of Stockbridge were asked about their aspirations for themselves (single males) and for their families, especially their children. Fifty-three percent of the sample wants a "better life," and 24 percent of the total group studied said they desire a "good" or "better job" for their children and for themselves (if single males). As far as educational aspirations, only 16 percent answered that they hope their children get more education than they have themselves (Table 19).

The general feeling of the workers (heads of family) is that their children get a better job than their own. The single males in the sample want a better job than their parents. The findings show that only one worker wants his children to have the same kind of job as he (farm work). Twenty-six migrant laborers (58 percent) wish a job for their children and for themselves (single males) in a city, varying from a construction worker, to some urban middle class job such as teacher, typist, salesman, and so forth.

TABLE 19

NATURE OF ASPIRATIONS FOR MIGRANT WORKERS (SINGLES)
AND MIGRANT WORKERS' CHILDREN,
STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966

Categories	Number	Percent
Better life	24	53.3
Good or better job	11	24.4
To study and get more education	7	15.6
No answer	3	6.7

Concerning the specific future plans for the workers' children and the single males of the sample, the information given by the respondents was divided into two categories: plans which improve the person, and plans which do not improve the person. Two-thirds of the informants have future plans for their children and for themselves (single males) which will improve the person, like studying, getting a better job, or having a better life, etc. The other one-third of the population studied, have future plans which do not improve the self per se, such as same job (farm work), any plans to marry (for single males), etc.

The migrant workers in the sample were asked about the level of education that they (single males) and their children must have. The general aspiration level given by informants studied is that children and single males should finish a high school education. The findings show that 23 workers

(52 percent) said a high school education is necessary, while 11 respondents (24 percent) answered less than a high school education while only 7 persons (16 percent) said more than high school education. These seven workers saw a need for only a year of college at most.

The author states that in general the heads of families and single males have the idea that the children and themselves (single males) must have a better way of life, better job and more education. Most of the workers and some single males think that the highest degree of education is high school. For that reason, they have the aspiration that their children must reach this level of education; few migrant workers know about college and post-graduate education.

Style of Life in the Mexican-American Migrant Farm Worker

In this section of the description of the migrant labor force in the area studied, we will focus on how these people live, what their recreational activities are, the social participation of these workers in the community, and other common life patterns.

These workers work long hours in the field. Almost all of the workers spend 10 hours or more per day working on the field. Some women and children work the same number of hours that men work; but generally women and chilren* spend 7 or 8 hours working in the field.

---

*There children are less than 16 years old.

What about recreation during the work season? This aspect of the life of the migrant workers was almost totally lacking. The absence of recreation activities among these people is general. The only recreation activities that they have during the work season in the area of Stockbridge is to go to town for shopping and sometimes for a walk around town. The main recreation activities for the old people is to visit friends or relatives and talk with them. For the young people recreation includes some activities such as listening to the radio and record player, going to town and playing pool, and some dancing. However, most of them mentioned movie-going as one of the most common recreation activities in their home town.

The only free day that the migrant workers have during the week is Sunday and some Saturday afternoons which they spend for grocery shopping. On Sundays, most of the migrant workers stay at home for resting and talking with neighbors.

When asked, "How often do you go to town?" 35 workers (78 percent) said they go once a week, 3 respondents (7 percent) said they go twice a week, and 3 workers (7 percent) said they do not travel. Of the rest, one person said sometimes and the other answered daily. In general, the "recreation" activities in town done by the population studied include shopping, movies, play pool, visit relatives or friends.

The mode of travel around the area used by the respondents is by car or truck. Thirty-two workers (71 percent) answered that they travel by car and the remaining 13 respondents (39 percent) said they travel by truck. Of the 32 workers who travel by car, 24 own a car, and of the 13 persons who travel by truck, only 8 own the truck. The rest of the total population ride with someone else.

Two questions were included in the schedule in order to discover if the migrant workers were well acquainted with local residents and if non-Spanish speaking people are friendly with them. Twenty-two workers (44 percent) said they are well acquainted and 25 (56 percent) said they are not. Thirty-eight (85 percent) said the people in the area are friendly with them while 7 workers (16 percent) said non-Spanish speaking people are not friendly. However, the relationships that these local people have with the migrants is only at the work; there are no relationships between families, only between workers and local residents.

Migrant workers have a low degree of printed matter readership. Twenty of the respondents (42 percent) said they read newspapers, 10 (21 percent) said they read magazines, and 17 persons (35 percent), said they do not read anything. Even among those who read, readership is very low. Only 6 persons (24 percent) read daily, 8 (32 percent) read once a week, 5 (20 percent) read "sometimes" and 2 (8 percent) read three times a week.

With regard to radio listening, 41 workers (91 percent) answered that they listen to the radio. Frequency of listening was measured by asking the workers how many hours per day they listen to the radio. Fifteen respondents (33 percent) said one hour, 14 persons (30 percent) answered two hours, 6 workers (13 percent) said three hours, 5 others (11 percent) responded four hours, 3 (7 percent) said 30 minutes per day and another 3 persons (7 percent) did not answer the question. However, most of the migrant workers and their families watch television from 2 to 5 hours per day. Their favorite programs were in Western setting, such as Laredo, Daniel Boone, Wild Wild West, and Bonanza.

The social participation of the migrant workers in the communities where they are working is very low. The only real contact involves being customers at the grocery and clothing stores. However, the people of Stockbridge say they accept these people as a part of the town.

The knowledge of the migrant workers about civic, religious and governmental agencies working in the area with migrant workers and their families is very low. The workers were asked about what groups were working with migrants and their families. Two-thirds of the sample said they did not know any group working with or helping migrant workers, 8 (18 percent) said they knew of some religious group, 4 workers (9 percent) said some employees from school, and only one respondent said a governmental group.

In general, then, the migrants acknowledged that the Catholic church and some schools were working with migrant workers. Practically no workers had any opinions about how well these groups were performing.

Summary. The migrant workers studied heard about their present jobs generally from crew leaders, but also from family, friends and direct from farmers. They were formally contacted about equally by crew leaders and farmers. The main reasons for coming to Stockbridge were for a "better job" of "better pay." Personal contacts were also important as well as having no job in Texas.

Fifty-eight percent of the workers said they made the decision by themselves, while only 12 percent said the family as a unit was involved in the decision to move to Stockbridge. One-fourth reported they had been influenced by other persons and 75 percent said nobody had influenced them. Eighty-two percent of the workers reported past farm experience while only 18 percent had some non-farm experience. With regard to farm experience, 64 percent said they have had only manual farm labor experience, and 37 percent have some experience in operating farm machinery.

The heads of families were mostly satisfied with their present job. The single male workers were not satisfied. However, the heads of families did not think that their occupation is a good one for their children. In general, the migrant workers hold aspirations that their children must have a better way of life, a better job and more education. But the educational aspiration for their children is only a high school level of education.

The migrant workers work long hours each day; they lack a variety of recreation activities during the work season; they travel very little during the work season, less than half of them are well acquainted with other persons living regularly in the area. Their participation in the community is very low; they read "a little" but listen to radio and watch television quite regularly.

CHAPTER IV

MIGRANT LABORER SATISFACTIONS AND ASPIRATIONS: SOME CORRELATES

Two factors can motivate people toward changing their way of life: a dissatisfaction with their present situation and aspirations for a life they perceive to be better. Four dependent variables dealing with satisfactions and aspirations of the people studied were chosen to correlate with the demographic independent variables.

Since this is a descriptive and exploratory study, no general hypotheses were formulated. Due to the small sample size and the lack of sophisticated measures of variables, these findings are presented as tentative and for the purpose of generating hypotheses and future research directions.

Ten independent and four dependent variables were chosen. The independent variables analyzed were age, language, marital status, education, personal income, family size, farm experience, migrancy or work mobility, and reasons for not working at another type of job. The four dependent variables were present job satisfaction, farm work occupational satisfaction, job aspirations for and by youth, and educational aspiration. Table 20 summarizes the results of the Chi^2 relationships.

TABLE 20

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF TEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND FOUR DEPENDENT VARIABLES STUDIED AMONG MIGRANT WORKERS IN STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN, 1966[1]

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables			
	Satisfaction 1 X^2	Satisfaction 2 X^2	Aspiration 1 X^2	Aspiration 2 X^2
Age	.29	2.20	4.50*	.02
Language	0	.97	3.02	2.05
Marital status	2.0737	.0033	1.2960	4.4089*
Education	.00045	2.41	8.82*	.02
Personal income	.22	3.94*	.044	9.34*
Family size	5.11*	.86	.73	.97
Farm experience	1.40	.23	.048	.18
Migrancy	.018	1.07	.04	.05
Work out of Mich.	.55	.03	.71	2.40
Reasons	3.70	.16	.42	.20

[1] Satisfaction 1 refers to the degree of satisfaction workers have with their present job in Stockbridge. Satisfaction 2 deals with how satisfied workers are with farm work as a way of life. Aspiration 1 refers to the migrants' job aspirations for children and youths. Aspiration 2 involves the degree of educational aspirations.

*Significant at the .05 level of probability

Present Job Satisfaction

Three independent variables had a substantial relationship with this dependent variable (Satisfaction 1): marital status, family size and reasons for not working at another type of job. However, only family size was significant at the .05 level of probability. This finding means that while the married people within the population interviewed were satisfied with their farm work, the single males were more unsatisfied with the same kind of job. These young people want to have a type of work other than farm work. Workers with a small family size were satisfied with the present farm job possibly because their earnings from this source are enough for the family support, but workers with a large family size were more unsatisfied. The logical reason for this dissatisfaction is that their earnings from farm work are not sufficient for the support and improvement of the family; the earnings are only enough for a subsistence style of life.

The last independent variable related to satisfaction with present job was verbalized reasons for not working at another type of job. Although not significant statistically, the relationship does tend to show that when people are satisfied with just any kind of job, it is difficult for these people to want to move from farm work to another new job, especially if this is radically different from their own. Many factors influence migrants to not accept jobs different from farm work such as lack of experience, personal relations, and family influence.

Farm Work Occupational Satisfaction as a Way of Life

From the findings and the results of the analysis, we can say that the old people within the population studied were satisfied with farm work as a way of living. For them, this type of job supplies the means for living in poor conditions. However, for the young people the farm work is not a good way of life. They were unsatisfied with this type of work.

Migrants with a "high" degree of education were more unsatisfied with farm work as a way of life, but those workers whose level of education is low were docile and satisfied with this type of job as a way of life. The most educated people in the sample studied desired to have other kind of occupation different from farm work.

Other results of the statistical analysis show that personal income was related to farm work occupational satisfaction as a way of life. The value of X^2 for both variables was 3.94 which was significant at the .05 level of probability. The direction of the findings show that those migrant workers with "high" personal income were satisfied with the farm work as a way of living; however, the migrants reporting low personal income were not satisfied with farm work. The findings suggest that migrants with low personal income have a minimum subsistence life style, especially when they have a large family size to support.

Job Aspirations For and By Youth

The results show that the younger heads of families and single male teenagers had higher aspirations for a better job for their children and for themselves (single males). Migrant parents seem to want the best for their children while the young workers want to have jobs better than their fathers. The types of desirable jobs mentioned by the migrant workers involved non-farm work.

Language was an independent variable related to job aspiration for and by youth. The findings show a tendency for people who speak English fluently to have more aspiration for a better job for their children than people who do not speak English. The people studied know that their inability to speak English is a main barrier to getting a better job.

The more educated people among the migrant population studied have a higher degree of aspiration for a better job other than farm work for their children or themselves. Migrants with less education only aspire to do farm work.

Educational Aspiration

The migrant workers who speak English well have more educational aspiration for themselves and for their families. In general, the educational aspiration level for almost the whole sample is that the children attain a high school degree.

The findings also show that unmarried male migrant workers have aspirations for more education than married people. In addition, the migrants have aspirations for more education for their children rather than for themselves.

Personal income was strongly related to educational aspirations. The relationship showed that people with a high personal income have higher aspiration for more education than people who have low personal income. It is possible that people with low personal income need their children's work to increase family income and for that reason do not want their children to have more education. However, this finding suggests that those migrants who need education and training the most desire it least.

Those workers who travel widely have higher educational aspirations for themselves and for their children than those who do not travel. Perhaps the highly mobile worker communicates more widely and knows more about American society and this develops a higher educational aspiration from his more diverse experiences.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Little is known about the Mexican-American migrant labor force which constitutes 53 percent of the hired farm labor in Michigan today. This pilot study is an attempt to learn about the demographic and behavioral characteristics of Spanish speaking migrant workers on four farms in the area of Stockbridge, Michigan, located in the southeast part of Ingham County, 40 miles from Lansing.

An non-experimental and cross sectional design was used. The number of workers in the purposive sample studied was 45. The data from the migrant workers were gathered from two sources: 33 heads of family and 12 single males 16 years of age and older. The method of collecting data was personal interviews with the migrant workers. Additional information from farmers who employ Spanish speaking laborers, key persons in the community of Stockbridge, and observations made by the interviewers contributed to the total information.

Demographic characteristics. The migrant workers studied were relatively young. 55 percent of the total group was under 30 years of age. The level of education of the sample studied was very low. The average years of school completed by workers was 3.7. However, educational opportunities for young people seem to have increased during recent years and migrant worker youths are taking advantage of it. The average of personal income was $1890 last year and 42 percent of the workers had some income from non-farm work - the average income from this work was $486. The average family income was $2600 last year. Of this income the migrant workers' wives and children's average contribution was $573 and $663 respectively.

The average family of migrant workers studied had 3.6 children. Ninety-one percent of the migrant workers had their family with them on the job which means that they move from their place of residence generally in Texas, to the place of work with their family. Sixty-one percent of the laborers said they have children attending school. The average of years of schooling completed by the workers' children was 5.1, however, more than half of the children will continue their education in the next school year. The average years of school of the migrants' wives is 3.0 grades completed; the wives' ages ranged from 17 years of age to 60 years with an average of 34 years.

The whole population studied was Spanish speaking people, however 60 percent of them speak English and 40 percent of those who speak English have problems with this language. The whole labor force studied was Roman Catholic; the church attendance by workers during the work season is low because of the lack of Roman Catholic churches in the area of Stockbridge.

Of the workers interviewed, 62 percent were born in Texas, 7 percent in Michigan and 31 percent were of Mexican origin. Now 89 percent of the whole group are residents in Texas, 7 percent are residents of Mexico and 2 percent live in Wisconsin. According to the place of origin, 62 percent of the workers are from a city, 29 percent are from farm communities and 9 percent are from non-farm communities of less than 2500 inhabitants.

Two-thirds of the sample have worked previously in the Stockbridge area. Half of the migrants have worked other places in Michigan. About one-fourth of the sample have not worked outside of Michigan, one-fourth have worked both in Michigan and the Midwest, and half the sample have worked in at least one Western state.

Behavior Patterns and Attitudes. Half the workers heard about their job through a crew leader while the rest generally heard from a family member or friend. Nine percent heard of their job directly from the farmer and only one worker heard from an employment agency. Nearly half the workers were formally contracted by a crew leader while a third were contracted directly by the farmer. Half the workers said they came to Stockbridge because of a better job or better pay and two-fifths came because of no job available in Texas. The decision to come to Stockbridge was usually made by the male worker himself but one-fourth of the workers discussed the job with their family. Only two-fifths of the workers had any previous non-farm work experience. A little over one-third of the workers have had some experience operating farm machines.

In general, the migrant workers were satisfied with their present farm work. For the family head, farm work is a good way of living; however, they think that the same work is not good for their children. Half the sample want a better life, while one-fourth want a good or better job for their children. Two-thirds of the informants studied have future plans for their children which will improve their ability to get better jobs.

Generally speaking, the migrant workers spend a average of 10 hours per day working in the field. They do not have recreation activities for themselves and their families during the work season; the activity mentioned most was shopping in town. They usually travel in and around the area once a week. The workers and residents report a good relationship between them and other persons living regularly in the area, especially with other field workers.

Migrant workers have a low degree of readership. However, nearly all of them listen to the radio regularly and most of the migrant laborers and their families watch television several hours per day. The social participation of these poeple in the community of Stockbridge is very low. The people of this community say they accept Mexican-American migrant workers as a part of the town. But few of the workers know about the civic, religious and governmental groups working with the migrant workers and their families in the area.

Predispositions for Change: Characteristics Related to High Levels of Satisfaction and Aspiration

By the use of four-fold chi^2 tables, it was found that those migrants least satisfied with their present job in Stockbridge were those unmarried, those who had large families, and those who gave reasons for not working at a non-farm job. Those workers most dissatisfied with migrant labor as a way of life for them and their children tended to be younger, to have more education, and to have a lower personal income.

Those workers who aspired to a better job tended to be younger, to have greater competency in English, and to have more education. Those workers exhibiting high educational aspirations for themselves or their children tended to have greater competency in English, to be unmarried, to have more personal income, and to have more farm work experience outside of Michigan.

CONCLUSIONS

General. The Mexican-American migrant worker occupies a lonely, almost isolated place in the American social system. For several decades the migrant has been kept in almost complete functional isolation from Anglo-Saxon people, who have done little to incorporate this ethnic group into the social system. However, an integration and amalgamation is beginning at the present time and the impetus for this integration is growing among Americans as it becomes apparent that mechanization will eventually eliminate much manual labor. Several different kinds of problems, however, impede this integration.

The migrant worker has a specific role to perform in the rural system. The unskilled agricultural operations, manual labor and some machinery operations, are the kind of work that these people do on the field. The time demands made and low wages paid results in no effective communicative relationship between the migrant worker and American society. As most members of American society better their position, the Mexican-American migrant worker enjoys a relatively lower social status.

The main relationship between migrant worker and the American society is through farmers who employ these people. Other relationships are through school, which is playing the key role in the integration of the Mexican-American migrants and their families, especially the children, into the American society.

Sociological Notions. One of the main problems of the Mexican-American migrant worker is the lack of knowledge of the English language. This barrier limits the social interaction of the migrant worker with other members within the social system, and at the same time, this problem had been one factor which had kept the migrant worker isolated from the general society.

The human interaction between the migrant worker and other members of the social system has been limited to simple socialization into a subculture within which the migrant worker acts.

The Mexican-American migrant worker in contrast to most laborers, most closely represents the social class which Marx called the "oppressed" or "proletariat." These people have been exploited for several decades by the capitalistic farmer entrepreneur who barely makes a profit and must sell his food at the consumer's price. This exploitation by a nebulous "oppressor" involves long hours of labor which the migrant worker does, the work of children and women under the same conditions as men, the low wages, the poor conditions of housing, and the lack of equal health and welfare conditions.

The notion of organized social change among the Mexican-American migrant worker is almost unknown. This notion, however, will take root in the minds of the young generation which is more dissatisfied, aspire to a better status and feels an urgent need for changing their way of living. The learning of new job skills, increasing education, and organizing are being considered by groups of young people. It is significant that the tendency for social change lies with the new generation of migrant workers. Thus, we find that the number of young males within the farm labor force is less every year.

On the other hand, the older people resist many cultural innovations in their pattern of living which brings new directions to their lifes and to the structure of the social system of work. Among these people the probability of individual transformation and of participation in social change is low.

A great feeling of alienation or separateness from the American society is found among the Mexican-American labor force. The lack of social participation of the migrant workers in the community and in the society in general affairs is obvious. The economic, political and social participation of these people is limited by a great number of factors. The only real participation of the migrant worker in the life of the society is as a field worker during a season of six or eight months per year. The relationship between these people with other non-Spanish people is nil. From these conclusions, two questions are raised. Does American society not want to integrate the Mexican-American migrant workers or are these people so bound to their sub-culture that they do not want to be integrated into the American society? Both questions may be a theme for further research.

Practical Implications. The main barrier which impedes the improvement of the migrant workers is their low English fluency. It appears necessary to structure a special program for those people who do not speak English. This is a prerequisite for their developing of their abilities in agriculture and other activities different from farm work.

The low level of education is also a limitation for the migrant workers' improvement. A special program of adult education could be structured in order to improve the degree of education of these people.

The migrant workers' lack of experience in activities other than farm jobs is another barrier for their improvement. Training in skilled urban jobs is necessary for the workers in the labor force, especially for those who have some past experience in these kinds of jobs.

Changing the behavior of the migrant workers' wives is another urgent need for these people. A program for wives must include formal and informal education in home economics and health.

It seems that the farm community could involve the migrant workers in its activities more. In this manner, the feeling of alienation of the migrants will decrease. To structure recreation programs for the migrants and their families must be a community affair.

Bibliography

Andrews, Wade H. and Saad Z. Nagi, Migrant Agricultural Labor in Ohio, Ohio Agricultural Experimental Station, Wooster, Ohio, Research Bulletin 780, Sept. 1956.

Jorgensen, Janet M., David Williams and John H. Burma. Migratory Agricultural Workers in the United States. Mimeo Report. Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. No date given (Probably after 1960).

Metzler, William H., The Farm Worker in A Changing Agriculture. California Agricultural Experimental Station and the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Giannini Foundation Research Report #277. Sept., 1964.

Michigan Employment Security Commission, Michigan Farm Labor Report 1964. Employment Service Division, Detroit, Michigan, 1964.

Mueller, Louis E., M. D. "Migrant Labor in Ohio" Ohio's Health, Vol. VI, No. 10, October, 1954.

Schmidt, Fred H., After the Bracero: An Inquiring into the Problems of Farm Labor Recruitment. Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles, Oct. 1964.

Taylor, Milton C., An Approach to the Migratory Labor Problems Through Legislation, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Governor's Commission on Human Rights, Madison, Wisconsin, August, 1950.

Thaden, J. H., Migratory Beet Workers in Michigan, Michigan State College Agricultural Experimental Station, Special Bulletin 319, East Lansing, Michigan, Sept. 1942.

APPENDIX A

El presente estudio con los trabajadores emigrantes de habla hispana, tiene como objecto conocer las caracteristicas sociales, economicas y demograficas de los mismos, para poder conocer y entender mejor los problemas que tienen durante su trabajo en el area de Stockbridge, Michigan.

Todas las respuestas en el presente cuestionario se mantendran en las mas estricta reserva, y seran usadas unicamente para los fines que anteriormente se expone, Nombres y domicilios de personas, seran conservadas en la misma forma.

Nombre del agricultor ______________________________

Lugar del rancho __________________________________

Fecha de la Entrevista _____________________________

Tiempo: Comenzo: ________________ Termino: __________

Nombre del entrevistador ____________________________

CUESTIONARIO PARA TRABAJADORES
EMIGRANTES EN EL AREA DE STOCKBRIDGE, MICH.

1. Nombre ______________________ 2. Estado de origen ________________

3. De que parte del estado es? ________________________________

4. Es usted de una comunidad agricola? ______________ De ciudad? __________

De un pueblo pequeno no agricola? ________________

5. Donde vivia antes de venir aqui? ________________________________

6. Cuando llego a esta area? ________________________________

7. Es esta la primera vez que usted viene a esta area? ________________

8. SI no, cuantas otras veces? ________________

9. Cerca de que ciudades en Michigan trabajo usted antes? ______________

10. En que otros estados de los Estados Unidos trabajo antes usted? ___________

____

11. Porque vino usted aqui? ________________________________

____

12. Done oyo usted acerca de su actual trabajo? ________________

13. Antes de que usted viniera aqui, tenia otro tipo de trabajo? __________

Done? ______________________ Que trabajo?____________________

Cuanto tiempo trabajo en este trabajo? ________________________

14. En general , su trabajo es de campo o urbano?______________________

15. Que clase de experiencia como trabajador de campo ha tenido?__________

____

16. Quien lo contrato para su actual trabajo?________________________

17. Fue usted contratado a traves de una oficina especial? ________Que oficina?

________________________Donde esta esta oficina? ______________

18. Fue el contratista o el agricultor a su comunidad para reclutar trabajadores de campo? ____

19. Escribio usted al contratista o al agricultor solicitando trabajo?____________

____

____

20. Pago usted algun dinero por el contrato? ________________ Si si, cuanto?

____

21. Cree usted que este es un buen contrato para usted? ____________________

22. Por cuanto tiempo es su contrato? ____________________________________

23. Como vino usted aqui, en carro? _____ en autobus? _____ en tren? _____ en troca?

____

24. Pago usted por el viaje? ______________ Si si, cuanto? ____________________

25. Quien hizo la decision de venir aqui? ____________________________________

LAS SIGUIENTES DOS PREGUNTAS SON PARA JEFES DE FAMILIA, EXCEPTO 27-A Y 27-B.

26. Consulto con su esposa acerca del actual trabajo antes de venir? ______________

27. Consulto con sus hijos? __________________ Con otras personas?________________

Quien? ____

27-A. Antes de venir aqui, consulto con sus padres acerca de este trabajo?_________

Con otras personas? __________________ Quien? _____________________________

27-B. Le preguntaron sus padres si queria venir o no? ________________________

28. Alguna persona lo influencia para venir aqui?________________ Quien?_____________

____

29. Le gusta este tipo de trabajo mucho? ______ algo? ______ poco?______ nada?_____

30. Esta satisfecho o contento con su trabajo? _____________________________

____

31. Cree usted que el trabajo de campo como el suyo es un buen medio de vida para usted y su familia? ______________ Porque? ________________________________

____

32. En un dia promedio, cuantas horas trabaja usted? ____________________

33. Que otras clases de trabajo puede usted hacer? ____________________

____

34. Que otras clases de trabajo ha hecho usted? ____________________

____

35. Tiene usted alguna experiencia en estos tipos de trabajo?____________

____

36. Si si, que clase de experiencia? ____________________

____

37. Le gustaria trabajar en alguno de estos trabajos, mas que en el presente?______

____

38. Done podria usted conseguir este tipo de trabajos? ____________________

____

39. Porque no esta usted trabajando en este tipo de trabajo actualmente?__________

____

40. Cree usted que es dificil conseguir trabajo de campo ahora? ____________

Porque? ____

41. Approximadamente, cuales fueron sus ingresos el ano pasado? ____________

42. Estos ingresos incluyen los sueldos y ganancias de otros trabajos diferentes a su trabajo de campo? ____________ Que trabajos? ____________

____

Cuanto o que porciento es por estos trabajos? ____________________

43. Sus actuales salarios son pagados por hora? _____ dia? _____ mes? _____ pieza?

____

44. En total, cuales fueron los ingresos de su familia el ultimo ano? ____________

45. De estos ingresos, cuanto o que porciento es por trabajo de otros miembros de su familia? ______________ De la esposa? ______________ de los hijos? __________________ de padres o abuelos? ____

46. Cuantas personas estan bajo su manutencion? ______________________________

47. Esta su familia con usted aqui? ____

DE LA PREGUNTA 40 a la 64 SON PARA JEFES DE FAMILIA SOLAMENTE, EXCEPTO LA 64- A.

48. Cual es la edad de su esposa? ____

49. De que estado es ella? ____

50. Trabaja su esposa con usted en trabajo de campo? ______________________________

51. En un dia promedio, aproximadamente cuanto tiempo dedica ella al trabajo de campo? ____

52. Queria su esposa venir aqui? ________________ si no, porque? ________________

____

53. Tiene ella algunos problemas aqui? __________ Si si, que clase de problemas?

____

54. Cuantos hijos tiene usted? __________ Casados? __________ Solteros? __________

55. Estan todos sus hijos solteros con usted aqui? ______________________________

56. Nombres y edades de sus hijos bajo su manutencion? ______________________________

____

____

____

57. Cuantos de sus hijos solteros estan trabajando en trabajo de campo con usted ahora? __________________________

58. Asistieron sus hijos a la escuela? __________________ Donde? ________________

59. Van ellos a la escuela ahora? ____________________ en dondé? ____________________

60. Anos de escuela de cada unos de sus hijos? ____________________

____

____

61. Tiene usted planes para que sus hijos asistan a la escuela de verano?________

____

62. Hay escuela de verano para hijos de trabajadores emigrantes en esta area? _____

____

63. Que distancia hay de aqui a la escuela de verano? ____________________

64. Querian sus hijos venir aqui? ____________________

64-A. Queria usted venir aqui? ______________ Si no, porque? ____________________

65. Cuales son algunos de los problemas que sus hijos tienen aqui? ______________

____

____

65-A. Tiene usted algunos problemas aqui? __________ cuales? ____________________

____

66. Usted cree que este trabajo es bueno para sus hijos? ____________________

____

____

66-A. Cree usted que este trabajo es bueno para usted? ____________________

____

67. Queclase de vida quiere usted para sus hijos? ____________________

+ ____________________

____

67-A. Que clase de vida le gustaria tener? ____________________

____

68. Que clase de trabajo? ____________________

68-A. Que clase de trabajo le gustaria tener? ____________________

69. Que planes para el futuro tiene para ellos? ______________________________

____

69-A. Que planes para el futuro tiene para usted? ______________________________

____

69-B. Que le gustaria ser? ______________________________

70. Cree usted que ellos deben tener mas educacion que usted? ______________

70-A. Cree usted que deberia tener mas educacion que la que tiene? ______________

71. Cuanta? ______________________________

71-A. Cuanta? ______________________________

LAS SIGUIENTES 4 PREGUNTAS SON PARA JEFES DE FAMILIA SOLAMENTE

72. Respecto a sus hijas, que cree usted deben aprender? ______________

73. Deben ellas estudiar? ______________

74. Deben ellas estar en la casa? ______________________________

75. Cuanta educacion cree usted deberan tener sus hijas? ______________

____

____

76. Tiene otros parientes con usted aqui? ______________

77. Si si, cuales parientes tiene usted? ______________________________

78. Estan ellos trabajando con usted en trabajo de campo? ______________

____

Informacion adicional

1. Edad ______________ 2. Estado civil ______________

3. Asistio usted a la escuela? ________ Donde? ______________

4. Cuantos anos completo en la escuela? ______________

LAS SIGUIENTES 2 PREGUNTAS SON PARA JEFES DE FAMILIA SOLAMENTE

5. Su esposa asistio a la escuela? ______ Donde? ______________________________
6. Cuantos anos de escuela completo ella? ______________________________
7. Cual es su religion? ____________________
8. En su opinion, cree usted que es importante asistir a la Iglesia? ____________
9. Cual es su idioma materno? ________________________
10. Habla usted otro idioma? __________ Que idioma? ______________________________
11. Tiene usted problemas con este idioma? ______________________________
12. Sabe de algunos grupos o agencias religiosas, civicas o de gobierno que estan trabajando con emigrantes y con familias de emigrantes en esta area? __________

    ____
13. Donde estam estos grupos o agencias trabajando? ______________________________
14. Conoce usted que clase de trabajo estos grupos o agencias estan haciendo? _____

    ____
15. Lee usted periodicos o revistas? ______________________________

    ____
16. Cuales? ____________________________ Cada cuando? ____________________________
17. Escucha usted radio? _____ Cuantas horas en un dia promedio? ____________
18. Que hace usted y su familia para divertirse cuando no estan trabajando? ______

    ____
19. Como viaja usted aqui? en carro? ________________ en troca?________________
20. Tiene usted carro o troca? ____________ Pide ride a otra persona? ____________
21. Es la gente amigable con usted aqui? ______________________________
22. Esta usted bien familiarizado con alguien que viva regularmente en esta area?

    ______________ Si si, quien? ______________________________

23. Como los conocio? ____________________

24. Cada cuando va usted a Stockbridge, Gregory, Munith u otro lugar? ____________________

____

____

25. Que hace usted en estos pueblos? ____________________

____

26. Pertenece usted a alguna organizacion de trabajadores emigrantes? ____________________

27. Si si, cuales organizaciones? ____________________

OBSERVACIONES:

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MIGRANT WORKERS IN THE AREA OF STOCKBRIDGE, MICHIGAN

1. Name__________________________ 2. State of origin____________

3. What part of the state?______________________________________

4. Are you from a farm community?____________ From a city?_______

From a small non-farm town?______________________

5. Where were you living before coming here?____________________

6. When did you come to this area?____________________

7. Is this the first time that you come here?____________________

8. If not, how many other times?______________________

9. Near which cities in Michigan did you work before?____________

____

10. In what other states in the United States did you work

before?____

11. Why did you come here?_______________________________________

____

12. Where did you hear about your present job?____________________

13. Before you come here, did you have another type of job?_______

Donde?________________________What job?______________________

How much time did you work on this job?______________________

14. In general, do you do farm or urban work?____________________

15. What kind of experience as a farm worker have you had?________

____

16. Who contracted you for the present job?______________________

17. Were you contracted through a specific office?______________

What office?________________ Where is this office?___________

18. Did the contractor or farmer go to your town to recruit farm workers?____________________

19. Did you write to the contractor or farmer applying for the job?____

20. Did you pay any money for the contract?______________________

If yes, how much?______________________

21. Do you think that this contract is a good one for you?_______

22. For how long is your contract?_______________________________

23. How did you come by car?________ by bus?_________

by train?_________ by truck?_________

24. Did you pay for the trip?__________ If yes, how much did you pay?__________

25. Who made the decision to come here?__________________________

THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS ARE FOR HEADS OF FAMILY ONLY, EXCEPT 27-A AND 27-B

26. Did you talk with your wife about this job before coming?____

____

27. Did you talk with your children?______________ With other persons?__________________ Who?________________

27-A. Before coming here, did you talk with your parents about this job?__________________ With other persons?_____________

Who?____

27-B. Did your parents ask your preference on the job?_____________

28. Did someone influence you to come here?____________________

Who?____

29. Would you like this type of job much?_________ some?_________

a little?__________ or not at all?___________

30. Are you satisfied or happy with your job?____________________

____

31. Do you think that farm work like yours is a good way of life for you and for your family?_________________________________

Why?____

32. In an average day, how much time do you spend working?_______

____

33. What other kind of work can you do?__________________________

____

34. What other kind of work have you done?________________________

____

35. Do you have some experience on these types of jobs?__________

36. If so, what kind of experience?______________________________

____

37. Would you like to perform one of these jobs more than your present one?____

38. Where could you get this type of job?_________________________

39. Why are you not working at this type of job at present?______

____

40. Do you believe that at the present time farm work is difficult to get?__________ Why?______________________________

41. Approximately, what was your income last year?______________

42. Does this income include the salaries or profits from other sources different from your farm work?______________________

What sources?____

How much or what percent is from these jobs?________________

43. Are your present wages paid per hour?__________ day?__________

month?_____________ piece?______________

44. In total, what was your family income last year?_____________

45. From this income, how much or what percent is from the work of other members of your family?____________ Wife?___________

Children?_________________ Parents or grandparents?___________

46. How many persons are under your support?____________________

47. Is your family with you here?__________________________________

FROM QUESTION 48 TO QUESTION 64 ARE FOR HEADS OF FAMILY ONLY

48. What is your wife's age?________________________

49. What state is she from?_________________________

50. Does your wife work with you at farm work?___________________

51. In a typical day, approximately how much time does she spend on farm work?____

52. Did your wife want to come here?_____________________ If not, why?____

53. Does she have some problems here?____________________________

If yes, what kind of problems?_________________________

54. How many children do you have?____________ Married?__________

Singles?_____________

55. Are all of your single children with you here?______________

56. Children's names and ages under your support?________________

____

____

57. How many of your single children are working at the farm work with you now?_____________________________________

58. Did your children attend school?____________ Where?___________

59. Do they go to school now?______________ Where?________________

60. Years of schooling of each one of the children______________

____

____

61. Do you have plans for your children to attend summer school?

____

62. Is there a summer school for migrant workers' children in this area?________________________

63. How far from here is the summer school?______________________

64. Did your children want to come here?__________________________

64-A. Did you want to come here?_______________________ If not, why?

____

65. What are some of your children's problems here?______________

____

65-A. Do you have some problems here?____________ If yes, what problems?____

66. Do you think that this job is a good one for your children?

____

66-A. Do you think that this job is a good one for you?__________

67. What kind of life do you want for your children?__________

____

67-A. What kind of life would you like to have?________________

____

68. What kind of job?____

68-A. What kind of job would you like to have?________________

____

69. What future plans do you have for your children?__________

____

69-A. What future plans do you have for you?__________________

69-B. What would you like to be?________________________________

70. Do you think that they must have more education than you?

____

70-A. Do you think that you should have more education than you have now?____

71. How much?____

71-A. How much?____

THE FOLLOWING FOUR QUESTIONS ARE FOR HEADS OF FAMILY ONLY

72. In regard to your daughters, what do you think they should learn?________________________________

73. Must they study?________________________________

74. Must they stay at home?________________________________

75. How much education do you think that your daughters should have?________________________________

76. Do you have other relatives with you here?________________

77. If so, what relatives do you have?________________

78. Are they working at farm work with you?________________

____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Age____________________ 2. Marital status________________

3. Did you attend school?____________ Where?________________

4. How many years did you complete in school?________________

THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS ARE FOR HEADS OF FAMILY ONLY

5. Did your wife attend school?_______ Where?________________

6. How many years did she complete in school?________________

7. What is your religious faith?____________________________

8. In your opinion, do you think it is important to attend church?________________________

9. What is your mother language?____________________________

10. Do you speak another language?__________What language?_____ __________________

11. Do you have problems with this language?____________________

12. Do you know of any religious, civic or governmental groups or agencies working with the migrant workers and migrant's families?________________________________

13. Where these groups or agencies working?____________________

14. Do you know what kind of job these agencies or groups are doing?________________________________

15. Do you read newspaper or magazines?____________________

16. Which ones?____________________ How often?____________________

17. Do you listen to radio?____________________ How many hours in the average day?________________

18. What do you and your family do for recreation when you are not working?________________________________

____

19. How do you travel around by car?_________ by truck?__________

20. Own a car or truck?__________ Ride with someone else?_______

21. Are people friendly to you here?____________________

22. Are you well acquainted with anyone living regularly in this area?____________________ If yes, who?____________________

23. How did you happen to get acquainted?____________________

24. How often do you go to Stockbridge, Gregory, Munith or other place?________________________________

25. What do you do in these towns?____________________

____

26. Do you belong to any migrant workers organizations?________

27. If yes, what organizations?______________________________

OBSERVATIONS:

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FARMERS WHO EMPLOY MIGRANT WORKERS

1. What crops do you grow?________________________________

2. How many acres of each do you have?________________________

3. What kind of jobs or operations have to be done this time of year?________________________________

4. What are the various jobs, specifically, you have for hired labor?________________________________

5. Is there a local association of vegetable farmers?__________

6. Do you belong to any association of vegetable farmers?______
   If yes, Which?________________________________

7. About how many migrant workers do you have or expect to have this year?________________________________

8. What problems have you had with hired workers in the last few years?________________________________

9. Would you say your neighbors like having the migrants in the community?________________________________

10. Are you satisfied with the migrant workers help in the last few years?____

____

11. How rapidly is your farm and others around here becoming mechanized?____

____

12. How do you get your hired help?______________________________

____